THE DYNAMIC HARM PRINCIPLE

A Standalone Executable Brief

DHP-BRIEF-001 | Version 1.0

I. The Core Problem

Current governance systems are reactive by design. They allow individuals and communities to reach crisis states — homelessness, starvation, trauma, addiction — and then spend enormous resources on policing, emergency medicine, and incarceration to manage the fallout.

This is the Trauma Tax: the systemic cost of allowing biological and social nodes to hit hard-zero failure states. It is the single greatest inefficiency in how human societies are currently organised.

The Dynamic Harm Principle (DHP) is a protocol-level alternative. It does not propose a new ideology. It proposes a more efficient architecture.

II. The Three-Layer Architecture

The DHP functions as a bottom-up control system designed to minimise systemic harm while maximising individual autonomy. It operates as a three-layer stack:

Layer 1: The Survival Floor (The Kernel)

A hard-coded set of biological and resource minimums. In a DHP-enabled system, resource access — food, water, shelter, energy — is protocol-bound to prioritise these baselines automatically.

- The Floor is not a gift from a central authority. It is a background process of the infrastructure.
- Thresholds are defined by variable resource access: the Floor is met when a node's biological signals are within survival-stable parameters.
- The Floor does not change based on political whim. It is a physical constraint of the network.

Layer 2: The Truth Mesh (The Verification Layer)

Instead of a central authority deciding who is suffering, the DHP uses a decentralised verification mesh to detect harm in real time.

- Hurt signals are verified by cross-referencing decentralised sensor data and peer-witnessing.
- The system prioritises physical evidence over narrative claims to prevent metric gaming or false triggering.

- Claim validity filter: a Hurt signal can only be triggered by measurable conditions in the claimant's own biological or resource state — not by the behaviour or presence of another node.
- You do not prove your worth. The evidence of your state triggers the response.

Examples of measurable floor breaches:

- Caloric intake below survival threshold for 24+ hours (verifiable via self-report + peer-witnessing or medical assessment).
- No access to shelter in conditions below safe ambient temperature.
- Untreated acute medical condition presenting observable physical symptoms.
- Safety threat: documented exposure to violence or coercion within the node's immediate environment.

Non-examples (do not trigger the protocol): discomfort, disagreement, emotional distress caused by another node's lawful behaviour, or any claim that cannot be grounded in a physical or resource state of the claimant.

Layer 3: The Forking Mechanism (The Consent Layer)

The DHP solves political coercion through Sovereign Exit: the guaranteed ability to leave any community without losing access to the Survival Floor.

- A Valid Fork requires that the receiving node confirms Floor capacity before the transition completes. You cannot Fork into scarcity.
- Communities that produce high trauma will see their members Fork away. Reality, not voting, decides which systems are viable.
- The Floor itself enforces exit rights. Tyranny runs on manufactured dependency. Remove the dependency, and coercion loses its primary lever.

III. Known Failure Modes and Resolutions

Risk 1: Meta-Weaponisation

The problem:

A bad actor claims 'your existence harms me' to trigger a protocol response against another node.

Resolution:

The claim validity filter built into Layer 2 requires that Hurt signals reference measurable floor breaches in the claimant's own state. Presence-based or behavioural harm claims fail the evidence threshold by design. The protocol is structurally blind to narrative-based harm.

Risk 2: Initial Resource Bootstrapping

The problem:

How does the first node secure physical resources for a Survival Floor while still embedded in a scarcity-based system?

Resolution:

The first node requires a founding resource covenant: a group of individuals who voluntarily pool existing resources before the protocol is running. This is a one-time manual act — like loading an operating system for the first time. The automated system then maintains and grows what the founding act created.

Risk 3: Signal Latency

The problem:

The time gap between a harm event and the protocol-driven resource redirection.

Resolution:

Pre-positioning. Rather than responding to harm after detection, the Floor is maintained as a standing reserve. Resources are held at baseline levels continuously, so the response to a breach is release of existing reserves, not acquisition of new ones. Latency drops to near-zero.

IV. The Minimum Viable Node

The first real-world implementation of the DHP is a Sovereign Digital-Physical Cooperative (SDPC).

Scale	10–150 individuals (within Dunbar's Number)
Infrastructure	Shared resource pool (food, energy, housing) governed by an automated ledger that triggers assistance based on evidence of need, not social voting.
Success Metric	Elimination of poverty-based trauma within the node, producing measurably higher cognitive and social output than surrounding standard nodes.
Governance	No central authority. No king, no overlord, no required figurehead. The protocol governs. Nodes are sovereign.

V. Fractal Scale-Up

The DHP is not designed to be imposed top-down. It spreads through demonstrated efficiency.

- Level 1 — Individual: The DHP logic applied to personal decision-making and relationships. Harm is treated as a signal, not a moral failure.
- Level 2 — Local: Small communities adopt the protocol. The Survival Floor is established. The Truth Mesh operates between nodes. The Fork is available.

- Level 3 — Regional and Global: As DHP nodes prove more stable and cost-effective than standard governance nodes, the efficiency gap becomes undeniable. Adoption spreads because it works, not because it was sold.

The system is self-proving. It does not require belief. It requires implementation and observation.

VI. How to Run the DHP

This protocol is not a manifesto. It is an executable set of principles. To apply it:

- Identify the floor: What are the non-negotiable biological and safety minimums for the nodes in your context?
- Build the mesh: What evidence-based signals indicate a floor breach? Who or what can verify them?
- Guarantee the fork: Can every node leave without losing the floor? If not, the system is not yet DHP-compliant.
- Measure the trauma tax: What is the current cost of not having the floor in place? Use that as the funding argument.

The DHP does not require permission from existing power structures to begin. It requires a founding group, a resource covenant, and the willingness to run the protocol and observe what happens.